2.5
2.8
3.2
3.6
4.0
2.2
2.0
100 mm
1.0
1.1
1.25
1.4
1.6
2.8
2.5
2.2
2.0
1.8
ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ
abcdefghijklmnopqrstuvwxyz1234567890
ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ
abcdefghijklmnopqrstuvwxyz
1234567890
1.0 mm
1.5 mm
2.0 mm
A5
PG

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 278 047 CS 210 290

AUTHOR Turk, Judy VanSlyke
TITLE Information Subsidies and Media Content: A Study of Public Relations Influence on the News. Journalism Monographs Number 100.
INSTITUTION Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication.
PUB DATE Dec 86
NOTE 38p.
AVAILABLE FROM Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, College of Journalism, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC 29208 ($5.00, single issue).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Content Analysis; *Information Services; Journalism; *Media Research; *Newspapers; *News Reporting; Organizational Effectiveness; Propaganda; Publicity; Public Relations; *State Agencies
IDENTIFIERS Information Subsidies; Louisiana; Media Government Relationship; Media Role; Media Use; *News Sources; Public Information Officers

ABSTRACT

A study examined the relationship between one "family" of the media--newspapers--and one group of public relations (PR) practitioners--public information officers (PIO) for state government agencies--to determine the nature and level of influence the agencies have upon the media's agenda. Eight daily and Sunday newspapers published in New Orleans, Shreveport, and Baton Rouge were selected because of the cities' population and their residents' access to newspapers, while six Louisiana state agencies were chosen as providing a cross-section of PR styles or philosophies. The highest-ranking PIO in each of the agencies kept a log of all information subsidies ("packages") transmitted to the newspapers' journalists during a two-month period in 1984. Content analyses of information subsidies and newspaper agendas--news articles, feature stories, editorials, columns, and letters to the editor--supported the study's four hypotheses: (1) daily newspapers are more likely to use than discard information from state officials; (2) conformity to journalistic norms of newsworthiness is the most important factor in a paper's decision to accept a news release; (3) the agenda of issues in news stories using information from agency PIOs reflects the issue agenda and priorities of agency information susbsidies; and (4) PIOs who consider themselves as providers of persuasive propaganda are less successful than are officials who view themselves as providers of information. (NKA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

JOURNALISM MONOGRAPHS
Number 100 December 1986

ED278047

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Information Subsidies and Media Content:

A Study of Public Relations Influence on the News

Judy VanSlyke Turk

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AEJMC

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS210290

An AEJMC Publication

JOURNALISM MONOGRAPHS is one of six official publications of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication: *Journalism Quarterly* (founded in 1924); *Journalism Educator* (founded in 1946); *Journalism Abstracts* (founded in 1963); *Journalism Monographs* (founded in 1966); *Journalism Directory* (founded in 1983); and *aejmc News*, the organization's newsletter.

JOURNALISM MONOGRAPHS was supported for its first two years by a gift from the University of Texas, and until 1979 by the American Association of Schools and Departments of Journalism.

Most editions of JOURNALISM MONOGRAPHS are still in print and may be ordered from the Association. Microform and photocopies are also available through University Microfilms International, 300 North Zeeb Road. Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106. Please indicate series number, author and title when ordering single copies.

Monographs appearing here are regularly abstracted and indexed in *Historical Abstracts*, *America: History and Life* and *Resources in Education*.

aejmc

Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication

1621 College Street University of South Carolina
College of Journalism Columbia, SC 29208-0251 (803) 777-2005

Jennifer McGill
Executive Director

Judy Hall
Subscription Manager

Subscription Information

Address changes must reach the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication 30 days prior to the actual change of address to insure proper delivery. Copies undelivered because of address change will not be replaced. Other claims for undelivered copies must be made within four months of publication. You must give old address and Zip code as well as new address on changes. Subscriptions are nonrefundable. Subscription Rates: US individual $15; US institution $20; Foreign individual $20; and Foreign institution $25 (air mail surcharge, $12). Single issues, $5 (air mail surcharge $3).

POSTMASTER: Send address correction form to AEJMC, 1621 College St., University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC 29208-0251.

JOURNALISM MONOGRAPHS is published serially by AEJMC in Columbia, SC 29208-0251. Copyright 1986 by the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication.

JOURNALISM
MONOGRAPHS
Number 100 December 1986

JOSEPH P. McKERNS, *Editor*

BRUCE H. WESTLEY, *Founding Editor* (term: 1966-1982)
LEE B. BECKER, *Past Editor* (term: 1982-1985)

Ann Taylor, *Art Director*

Jeremy H. Lipschultz, *Editorial Assistant*

EDITORIAL BOARD

L. Erwin Atwood, Donald R. Avery, James L. Baughman, Beverly Bethune, Douglas Birkhead, Margaret A. Blanchard, Stuart J. Bullion, Thomas B. Connery, Dennis K. Davis, Everette E. Dennis, Robert E. Drechsel, David L. Eason, Terry Hynes, Owen V. Johnson, Arthur J. Kaul, David Kennamer, Jerilyn McIntyre, Jack M. McLeod, John T. McNelly, Kent Middleton, John S. Nichols, David P. Nord, Vincent P. Norris, Marvin N. Olasky, John Pauly, Jim Richstad, Gertrude J. Robinson, Thomas A. Schwartz, J. William Snorgrass, Vernone M. Sparkes, George E. Stevens, Robert L. Stevenson, Vernon A. Stone, Bruce M. Swain, James E. Swartz, Phillip J. Tichenor, Richard C. Vincent, Daniel B. Wackman.

Members of the AEJMC Publications Committee: George Everett, Sandra Moriarty, Carol Reuss, Byron Scott, Zoe Smith, Elizabeth Yamashita *(Chair).*

Manuscripts and other editorial correspondence should be addressed to the editor, School of Journalism, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois 62901-6601

TO CONTRIBUTORS

Submissions to *Journalism Monographs* should include an original and two copies, double-spaced throughout (including extracts, references and notes).

For style, consult the AEJMC Publication Manual (available from the Business Office at $2.50 per copy). Footnotes should be assembled at the end, not on the page. If a reference style is preferred, follow the style in the Manual. Tables and figures should be on separate pages, not in the text.

Authors are expected to be candid with the editor in matters pertaining to the origins and previous appearances of manuscripts. It is policy not to publish a long version of a study already published in a shorter version elsewhere.

JUDY VANSLYKE TURK

Information Subsidies and Media Content: A Study of Public Relations Influence on the News

Copyright 1986
by the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication

Accepted for Publication February 1986

JUDY VANSLYKE TURK is Associate Professor and Assistant Director of the H. H. Herbert School of Journalism and Mass Communication at the University of Oklahoma in Norman, Oklahoma.

INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS in the United States operate under an ethical imperative of public opinion. The opinion of the public in general and of specific segments of the public in particular at least influence organizational decisions even if those publics do not participate directly in organizational decision-making. Indeed, public expression and/or participation is one of the most basic tenets of the American democratic state within which all organizations, both "official" state institutions and private organizations, function. If this participation and expression is to be meaningful, an essential ingredient is access to information.[1] Who has access to information and to what sources of information they have access, seems an important determinant of whose opinion and participation has the potential for influencing organizational life. The literature indicates that the news media are major sources of the information which is the raw material of public opinion. The mass media are the major information channels which transmit knowledge about an organization to its most important publics.

The omnipotence of the media in shaping public opinion has come under increasingly close scrutiny since Walter Lippmann's pioneering work, *Public Opinion*.[2] That scrutiny has revealed, for example, that a good many people pay little attention to the media; that under certain circumstances, a good many others reject information in the media because it clashes with their firmly-held beliefs. That scrutiny also has revealed that various "gatekeepers" within media organizations make decisions about what information is forwarded to the public, and that the media carry not just unmanipulated factual information, but information tainted with the preferences and prejudices of journalists and of the sources upon whom journalists rely for their information.[3] But as

research into the role of the media *vis a vis* public opinion debunked the idea of an *omnipotent* mass media, it nevertheless provided evidence that the media *do* have pervasive effects. Media impact upon public opinion may not be as swift, as direct nor as overwhelming as once imagined, but there *is* a major impact. As Rivers and Schramm put it, the power of the mass media must be considered "not as a tidal wave but as a great river:"

> It feeds the ground it touches, following the lines of existing contours but preparing the way for change over a long period. Sometimes it finds a spot where the ground is soft and ready, and there it cuts a new channel. Sometimes it carries material which helps it to alter its banks. And occasionally, in time of flood, it washes away a piece of ground and gives the channel a new look.[4]

This role *vis a vis* the public's access to information, and *vis a vis* public opinion, makes the mass media an important influence, and perhaps even an "unofficial participant," in organizational behavior and decisions. While one might readily agree that the media are important providers of information, it would be oversimplification to say that the media are merely passive transmitters of knowledge or information. There is a significant body of research providing support for the notion that the media are more than a mirror on the world or a conduit for the concerns and issues of others. Indeed, the literature suggests that a media outlet, "in the process of transmitting others' concerns and issues...reworks and translates them" to focus attention and structure cognitions.[5] As Cohen puts it:

> The press is significantly more than a purveyor of information and opinion. It may not be successful much of the time in telling people what to think, but it is stunningly successful in telling its readers what to think about.[6]

Media Agendas and Information Subsidies

The agenda-setting capacity of the media has been extensively examined in the context of the influence and impact of the media in shaping cognitions and priorities of the public. There is significant research support, for instance, for the theory that the public learns both facts and the salience of those facts from the media, and that public perceptions and opinions toward issues and toward the individuals who espouse those issues are shaped by the media. Implicit in this body of research is a causal, or at least correlational, connection between a temporal sequence of events. First, the media disseminate news reports; second, these media reports create or alter perceptions of issue importance; and third, these perceptions of importance influence public thinking and action on those issues.[7]

The most recent agenda-setting research indicates that there are forces at work which mediate this agenda-setting impact. Among these mediating forces are the extent to which individuals rely upon the media as opposed to relying upon other potential sources of information, and individuals' "need for orientation."[8] But there has been little examina-

tion of another important mitigant upon the media's agenda-setting influence: the various factors that influence media content itself. If media content influences public opinion and perceptions, then who or what influences the media? The answer to this question of who sets the media's agenda seems particularly relevant to institutions and organizations which seek to "use" the mass media as middlemen in their attempts to inform and influence key constituencies and publics.

Few would deny that the world the public sees through the media's eyes is the media's construction of reality rather than a veridical account of events, people, places and issues. While news may be a window on the world through which Americans learn of their institutions and organizations, the window frame through which the media passes along news is of the media's own making:

> Through its arrangements of time and space as intertwined social phenomena, the news organization disperses a news net...Through naive empiricism, information is transformed into objective facts — facts as a normal, natural, taken-for-granted description and constitution of a state of affairs.[9]

The media present a pseudo-environment, a self-conceived perception of the world which is not necessarily the same as the world that is "really" there. But this pseudo-environment is not entirely of the media's own making. While individuals working for media organizations do make decisions as to what does or doesn't get on the agenda of salient, important "news" which is presented in media content, it can be argued that the sources of information upon which journalists rely ultimately have more to do with media content than the selection processes of journalists themselves. News is not necessarily what happens but what a news source *says* has happened because news doesn't "happen" until there is an exchange of information between newsmen and their sources.[10]

Gandy suggests that those with the power to control the *price* of information not only control whether that information is consumed, but also influence the decisions that are based upon that information. The cheaper the information is, the more likely it is to be consumed, says Gandy. Therefore, sources who make information quickly and inexpensively available to journalists through what Gandy calls "information subsidies" increase the likelihood that the information will be consumed by the journalists and used in media content:

> Whereas the journalist selects from an array of sources and events on the basis of perceived utility in producing news that will meet organizational requirements, sources select from an even wider array of information and techniques for conveying that information on the basis of perceived effectiveness in being covered, reported and transmitted in the right form, at the right time, and in the right channel...selected ultimately on the basis of their relative efficiency in the production of influence over the knowledge, attitudes and behaviors of others.[11]

This interaction between sources who provide information subsidies and journalists who receive and are influenced by those subsidies was

described by Gans as a dance. More often than not, the sources do the leading, initiating contact with representatives of the news media, making themselves available, selling story ideas and seeking to "manage the news by putting the best light on themselves" and those they represent.[12]

More often than not, the sources who do this "leading" are public relations practitioners working on behalf of institutions and organizations. These officially-designated sources seek to systematize the attempts of organizations to influence first media content and then the opinions of those segments of the public who rely upon the media for information. These public relations practitioners are the junction point for interaction between organizations and the media, and are charged with the responsibility of providing "official" organizational versions of reality to the media. They attempt to influence the media's agenda, so that they may in turn influence the public opinion upon which their organizations depend for survival.

Public relations, part of the administrative apparatus of an organization, is one component of the broad spectrum of external relationships an organization has with its internal and external audiences. And central to the practice of public relations is the dissemination of information to an organization's various publics. For many public relations practitioners, the media are themselves an important public because although an organization also may communicate directly with key audiences, most of what an organization's key publics know about it is mass media created and disseminated.[13]

Whatever other communication functions he performs, the public relations practitioner is likely to see himself in part as an in-house reporter, ferreting out bits and pieces of information for transmittal to one or more publics *via* the news media. Practitioners serve a proactive function, originating news, at least information which they view as news, and providing this news to the media in information subsidies: press releases, news conferences and briefings or "official" organization documents or reports, for instance. But practitioners also serve a reactive function, responding to requests for information from journalists. Routines involved in providing these reactive information subsidies include activities such as making and returning telephone calls to answer journalists' questions or arranging for journalists to interview organizational "experts" for the information they seek. Combined, these proactive and reactive public relations routines are the currency of information subsidization, subsidies paid to the news media "in exchange for the privilege of reaching the public with a message that will reflect favorably on them" and on the organizations they represent.[14]

These public relations information subsidies may not be the preferred source of information for journalists, who perhaps wish they could personally gather the facts and figures of the environment they report rather than relying upon others. And the public relations practitioner may not be the preferred point of contact with organizations, since many journalists would undoubtedly prefer to talk to the boss rather than to an underling whose task is to be an informational go-between. But informa-

tion subsidies from public relations practitioners *are* used by journalists. And when there's consumption of an organization's message by the media — when the organization's information is made a part of the media's agenda and content — the organization stands at least a chance of influencing the public agenda.

Measuring the Impact of Information Subsidies

A study conducted in 1984 sought to examine just how successful public relations practitioners are in their information-subsidy activities. The study examined the relationship between one particular "family" of media — daily newspapers — and one particular group of public relations practitioners — public information officers for state government agencies — to address several questions related to the nature and level of influence organizations have upon the media's agenda as expressed in media content.

The study sought specifically to examine how much influence state government PIOs had upon daily newspaper content through the information subsidies they provided to journalists. Are these public information officers successful in winning media acceptance of the information they pass along through press conferences, news releases and other handouts to journalists? Do newspapers validate as news enough of the information subsidies they receive from these state agencies that what they publish portrays for the public an agenda of issues and problems congruent with the organizations' own agenda of what issues are salient and deserving of attention? Or is the agenda of state agency "business" reported by the media different enough from the agencies' own agendas that one would conclude that journalists play a larger role than official sources in what the public learns about these agencies from the media? Do journalists selectively filter agency information subsidies so that the "reality" portrayed in media coverage is less a mirror of an officially-constructed agency reality than the journalists' own construction of reality?

Several hypotheses related to these questions and to the body of literature which gave rise to them were tested in this study:

Hypothesis 1: When provided with information in news releases or other public relations "handouts" from government public information officers, daily newspaper gatekeepers are more likely to use that information in their published stories than they are to discard that information as not suitable for publication. Published stories about government are more likely to be based upon the government's "official" handouts of information than on information not obtained from these official government sources.

Although Jeffers suggests that reporters and public information officers are at philosophical odds, with reporters viewing publicists as "obstructionists" to obtaining full "truth,"[15] the literature demonstrates that journalists nevertheless *do* use the information contained in news releases and other public information "handouts." Fishman, for instance, noted that journalists, in an attempt to make

their information-gathering more efficient, view society as bureaucratically structured, and rely on "official" points of view for what they include in their news reports.[16] Gandy noted that bureaucratic, official sources of information are frequently used by journalists because those sources are viewed as reliable.[17] And several studies concluded that news releases substantially influence the content of the news media even though not all news releases are published. Cutlip found that 35 percent of newspaper content came from public relations handouts,[18] while Martin and Singletary reported that 59 percent of one organization's news releases generated at least one newspaper article.[19]

Hypothesis 2: The most important factor in a daily newspaper's decision to accept or reject a news release or other "handout" it receives from a public information officer is whether the information conforms to journalistic newsworthiness norms of oddity/conflict, prominence, significance and timeliness. The least important factor in that decision is an organizational consideration such as availability of space, time or staff resources.

There is considerable support in the literature for the notion that newsworthiness is the most frequently-used "test" as to whether information is included in media content. Harris, for instance, found that editors discarded publicity releases because the releases contained too few facts, did not deal with timely information or did not contain "new" information not before presented in the media.[20] Ward[21] and Galtung and Ruge[22] identified common news values that influence whether information was included in media reports. And Gans, while noting that available space or staff and deadline pressures also influenced media gatekeepers' selection decisions, concluded that newsworthiness was the primary test of whether information was usable or not.[23]

Hypothesis 3: The agenda of issues presented in information subsidies provided by "official" state government agency sources will influence the subsequent agenda of issues portrayed by that state's daily newspapers. Rank-order correlation of issues addressed in agency information subsidies and in newspaper stories which use subsidy information will demonstrate that the newspaper's content reflects the priorities exhibited by the agency information subidies.

While Newsom found that a group's agenda of issues as reflected in its internally-generated media was different from the agenda of issues presented by the mass media,[24] there is considerable support in the literature for congruence between the agendas of news sources and the media. Erbring, Goldenberg and Miller noted that a nation's political agenda typically includes the same issues that receive substantial attention in the news media,[25] and McCombs, Gilbert and Eyal found that to be the case when comparing presidential agendas in State of the Union addresses and subsequent media coverage.[26] Weaver and Elliott, in a comparison of city council agendas and media coverage, found that generally the news coverage reflected the council's agenda.[27] And Hale, comparing press releases and newspaper coverage of court decisions, found that newspapers emphasized the same types of decisions as the

court's own news releases.[28]

Hypothesis 4: Public information representatives of state agencies who view their role as providers of persuasive "propaganda" that serves the interests of their agencies are less successful in obtaining newspaper acceptance and use of their news releases and other "handouts" than are public information representatives who view themselves merely as providers of information regardless of whether that information is persuasive.

Grunig and Hunt suggest that some public relations behavior has as its purpose persuasion, with an organization seeking to change public attitudes and behavior to accept an organization's self-interests. One such behavioral model is that of press agentry/publicity, which Grunig and Hunt contrast with a public information model that has as its purpose dissemination of information that is not necessarily persuasive.[29] Journalists, who often carp that government public information officers are "flacks" who try to control the press and who try to disguise propaganda as fact,[30] might therefore be expected to place greater trust in information from PIOs who do not seem to be trying selfishly to persuade, and to use that information in their stories more often than persuasive information from persuasive press-agent PIOs.

Both quantitative and qualitative methods were used in the research undertaken to examine the hypothesized relationships between the media's agenda and the agenda of state government agencies. The media agenda was operationally defined as the editorial content or "news product" of the newspapers. Agency agendas were operationalized as information subsidies provided to newspapers. Both were measured empirically through content analysis. The how and why of information subsidy dissemination by agencies and use of those subsidies by the media also were measured qualitatively through interviews and observation.

A period of eight weeks, from September 16, 1984 through November 10, 1984, was selected as the time frame for content analysis of both media content and the content of information subsidies provided by agency PIOs to the media. Six cabinet-level departments of the state of Louisiana were selected to represent government agencies: agriculture, commerce and industry, justice, public safety, revenue and taxation, and the secretary of state's office. Eight daily newspapers in three Louisiana cities were selected to represent the media: morning, afternoon and Sunday papers in Baton Rouge, an all-day and a Sunday newspaper in New Orleans, and morning, afternoon and Sunday papers in Shreveport. Eight weeks provided a volume of both media content and agency information subsidies large enough for statistically-significant analysis. An eight-week period also took into account the possibility of a time lag between receipt and use of information subsidies by the media, a provision which proved to be adequate since experienced lags were generally of much shorter duration than eight weeks.

Selection of Agencies. The six state agencies whose information-subsidy activity was analyzed were selected because they provided a cross-section of public relations "styles" or philosophies. In 1984 the

author surveyed the 17 cabinet-level departments in Louisiana state government which employed designated public relations/public information representatives, testing a four-model typology of public relations behavior developed by Grunig.[31] Agencies were categorized, based on information supplied by their highest-ranking public relations official, as to which of Grunig's four models of public relations behavior was dominant in their day-to-day relationships with the public and with the media. The four models were press agentry/publicity, public information, two-way asymmetric or two-way symmetric.

The press agentry/publicity model of public relations behavior is characterized. according to Grunig, by activities designed to promote the agency, with information chosen for dissemination on the basis of whether dissemination would benefit the agency without necessarily considering the needs or interests of the public.[32] The Department of Revenue and Taxation and the Secretary of State's office were the two agencies whose day-to-day public relations behavior, in the opinion of their PIOs, best represented this model.

The public information model of public relations behavior is characterized by activities which provide truthful and accurate information about the agency, with the public information representative acting as "journalist in residence." This practitioner uses intuition to determine public interest, and tries to represent both public and organizational interests in his dissemination of information.[33] The Departments of Agriculture, and Commerce and Industry, based on their PIOs' evaluation of the way they practiced public relations, conformed to this behavioral model.

Two of Grunig's public relations models involve two-way communication, with communication *from* the public as important an influence on public relations behavior as communication *to* the public. The two-way assymmetric and two-way symmetric models both involve this two-way flow of information, with information provided *by* the organization only after consideration of feedback from the public as to public interests and needs. However, the asymmetric model is intended to be persuasive, even manipulative, in that feedback from audiences is used to guide the organization in how to get publics to behave as the organization wants them to behave. Symmetric communication, on the other hand, seeks agreement or compromise, actively representing the views of the public, whether pro-organization or not, as well as representing the views of the organization.[34]

Grunig noted that the two-way symmetric model is "newer," a relatively recent development in the evolution of public relations and one that public relations people talk about more than they practice.[35] Organizations are just beginning to appreciate the need for a compromise approach to their communication with important publics. So it was not altogether surprising that only one of the 17 state agencies categorized itself as representing this symmetric model. Because a single example of the two-way symmetric model was not viewed as a sufficient test of this particular model, and because only two of the 17 agencies categorized themselves as two-way asymmetric, the pair of two-way

models was combined into one category for purposes of selecting state agencies for the study sample. The two agencies in the sample that represented this combined two-way model were the Departments of Justice and Public Safety. Because of the collapsing of two of Grunig's models into one category, it was not possible to compare the performance of two-way asymmetric and two-way symmetric models of public relations in this study, and the drawing of conclusions as to differences between these two-way models in their influence on media coverage was precluded.

Although state agency public information officers categorized their agencies as to dominant model of public relations behavior, the instrument used for the categorization — the same as one used earlier by Grunig to test his four models on real organizations — did not ask *why* the agencies performed their public relations tasks the way they did. The reasons for their adoption of a particular "style" or model of public relations behavior were probed, however, in interviews conducted with PIOs for the six selected agencies at the conclusion of the study.

Grunig, adopting a contingency view, suggested that the different models of public relations behavior represented different responses to perceived environment and perceived constraints on organizational behavior.[36] While a particular model might dominate an organization's public relations behavior, the organization might choose different models in different sets of circumstances. The six state agencies selected for this study seemed to conform to Grunig's contingency view. With one exception, the PIOs said they varied their public relations behavior from situation to situation. While they might prefer, say, a public information approach to public relations, they said there were occasions when they determined that the persuasive approach of the press agentry/publicity or two-way asymmetric model might be more appropriate.

It was interesting, and perhaps significant, that those PIOs who had previous experience as journalists said they preferred the public information model of behavior — with themselves acting as "journalists in residence." With one exception — a PIO who said his activities were best described by the press agentry/publicity model — these former journalists identified the public information model as dominant for their agencies. They said that model enabled them to win the confidence and trust of reporters, because they would be seen as providing information the public needed and wanted rather than information that made their agencies "look good." PIOs without prior journalistic experience said their public relations communication was usually persuasive, best described by either the press agentry/publicity or the two-way asymmetric model of public relations.

Selection of Newspapers. Daily and Sunday newspapers published in New Orleans, Baton Rouge and Shreveport, Louisiana were selected because these cities represent the largest population centers in the state: New Orleans with a population of more than one million, Baton Rouge with almost 500,000 and Shreveport with almost 400,000. Together, these cities account for almost half of the state's population. These cities also presented another advantage in that their residents have access to

newspapers both in the morning and in the evening. Baton Rouge and Shreveport each have two daily newspapers, one in the morning and the other in the afternoon: the *Baton Rouge Morning Advocate*, the *Baton Rouge State-Times*, the *Shreveport Journal* and the *Shreveport Times*. New Orleans has only one newspaper, the *Times-Picayune/States-Item*, but it is an all-day newspaper with multiple editions throughout the day. All three cities have Sunday newspapers. The newspapers studied also have the largest circulations among daily newspapers in Louisiana, and all have full-time correspondents at the Louisiana State Capitol in Baton Rouge whose primary, if not sole, responsibility is providing news on the activities of state government.

Measurement of Agency Information Subsidies. Information subsidies were defined as the "packages" in which information was transmitted to journalists at the eight newspapers by public information representatives for the six state agencies. Written subsidies included news releases, copies of written agency reports or documents and copies of internal memoranda or memoranda from PIOs to reporters. Other subsidies were provided in telepone calls from PIOs to media personnel and vice versa; through in-person conversations, and in press conferences or background briefings for the media staged by agencies, whether or not written materials or news releases also were issued on those conferences and briefings. Identification of which agency routines or dissemination methods would be appropriate for measurement was made through a series of conversations with agency public information representatives and media personnel during the formulative stages of the research.

The highest-ranking public information officer in each of the six agencies kept a log of all information subsidies provided to journalists with the eight newspapers during the two-month study period. Each agency also provided copies of any written information subsidies as well as logging those written subsidies on a log form. Content information logged for each information subsidy included:

1. Date of the subsidy.
2. Identification of which newspaper(s) received the subsidy.
3. The method used to transmit the subsidy: by telephone, in person, by news conference, by written news release or by transfer of written agency document.
4. Whether the subsidy was initiated by the agency or was provided in response to a journalist's request for information.
5. The topic or issue of the subsidy. The eight issue/topic coding categories were election campaigns and politics; economics and finance; environment and natural resources; public health and consumer protection; public safety and criminal matters; recreation, culture and tourism; ceremonial events and celebrations; and administrative/personnel actions.

Measurement of Media Agendas. The media agenda of each of the eight newspapers was its editorial content: the news articles, feature stories, editorials and columns it published. Letters to the editor also were included as part of the media agenda because selection of which letters to publish was a content decision made by editorial personnel. Advertising

was excluded. Content of each of the eight newspapers was analyzed for the two-month study period. The home-delivery edition of each newspaper was selected for analysis. A total of 240 Monday-thrugh-Saturday issues and 24 Sunday issues were studied.

Manifest content was coded. Each article dealing with one or more of the six state agencies was coded as to:

1. The newspaper in which it appeared.
2. The date upon which it appeared.
3. Its placement in the newspaper by section and page number.
4. Its length in inches, and the length of its headline.
5. Whether the article was accompanied by a photograph.
6. The agency which was the primary subject of the article.
7. The type of article. Article categories used were spot news, interpretive comment or analysis, prediction or discussion of future implications, explanation or background on past events, feature, and column/editorial.
8. Slant of the story: whether it was favorable, neutral or unfavorable to the agency which was the subject of the article.
9. The topic or issue of the article. The eight issue categories coded were the same eight categories used in analysis of information subsidies.
10. Whether the article contained information that had been supplied in an agency information subsidy. This was an attempt to trace quantitatively whether the newspapers used agency information subsidies in writing their stories. Since *all* stories written over the eight-week period about the six state agencies were coded, it also was important to differentiate between those that relied upon agency PIO sources and those that did not. Therefore, if a newspaper published a story about an agency and the subject of that story had been the subject of an information subsidy provided by the agency prior to publication — and if all or part of the information contained in the subsidy was included in the published article — then it was concluded that the subsidy had been accepted by the media. Conversely, if a newspaper did not publish an article during the eight-week period containing information provided to it by an agency information subsidy during that same period, it was concluded that the subsidy had been rejected by the newspaper.

Reliability and Validity Checks. Intracoder and intercoder reliability checks were made upon both agency and newspaper data. Average intracoder reliability in content analysis of newspapers across variables was 95.2 percent, and intercoder reliability for the same data set was 94.3 percent. Intracoder reliability for agency information subsidy content analysis was 94.0 percent; no intercoder reliability check was necessary since one individual coded all agency data.

Qualitative inquiry was included in the research design to increase validity of the content analysis. A series of weekly interviews was conducted with the state capitol correspondent for each of the newspapers. The chief capitol correspondent was interviewed if the newspaper had more than one reporter in its capitol bureau. In these interviews, the

reporters were asked about each of the information subsidies they had received from the state agencies. Therefore information supplied by the PIOs on their subsidy logs could be verified — did the newspaper actually receive a particular news release, for instance — and use or rejection of subsidies as indicated by analyzed newspaper content could be verified as well. Reporters also could explain why they had or had not used each information subsidy received.

It is possible that these periodic interviews — as well as knowledge that they were being observed — may have sensitized the journalists into paying more (or less) attention to news releases and news stories relating to the six state agencies than they might have otherwise. However, it was felt that the gains in quality of information gathered through these somewhat intrusive measures would offset to a justifiable degree the risk of sensitization.

At the conclusion of the eight-week content analysis period, additional in-depth interviews were conducted with each of the capitol correspondents and with the highest-ranking public relations practitioner in each of the six agencies. The purpose of these "exit" interviews was to probe more thoroughly journalistic and source routines; questions were general, rather than specifically related to their activities of the preceding eight-week period.

Analysis of Agency Information Subsidies. The six Louisiana state agencies disseminated a total of 444 information subsidies to the eight Louisiana daily newspapers during the eight-week study period. The Department of Justice public information officer was the most active, providing 121 news releases and other handouts, and the Department of Revenue and Taxation's PIO was least active, disseminating only seven during the period, as shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1
Information Subsidies by Agency

Agency	*No. of Subsidies*	*Percent of Subsidies*
Agriculture	69	16
Commerce and industry	38	9
Justice	121	27
Public safety	96	22
Revenue and taxation	7	2
Secretary of State	113	25
Totals	444	100*

* Does not add to 100% because of rounding

An average of eight news releases, telephone calls or agency documents passed from agencies to newspapers each day, with the per day rate ranging from nine during the month of October to an average of just three per day in November. Reporters working for Baton Rouge

newspapers — *The Morning Advocate* and the *State-Times* — received more public relations handouts, 106 and 107 respectively, than their colleagues at either New Orleans or Shreveport papers. The three Sunday newspapers received the least public relations information items — only five of the total 444 subsidies.

Public information officers and journalists offered similar plausible explanations for this distribution. Because Baton Rouge is the state capitol, almost all state government is *local* news, and therefore fits readily into the Baton Rouge newspapers' view of news as local, close-to-home occurrences. For New Orleans and Shreveport papers, the local angle was much less automatic. Public information officers said they rarely sent information to Shreveport or New Orleans journalists unless the information either had obvious statewide impact or a specific local appeal to Shreveport or New Orleans newspaper audiences.

Because the newspapers included in the study were daily newspapers, most of the information used in one day's edition deals with people, places and things which "made news" after the previous day's edition had gone to press. Therefore, most news in a Sunday newspaper would have been generated on Saturday, a day state government offices — and the offices of the agency PIOs — are closed. With offices closed, news releases are not disseminated and telephone calls are not made, and Sunday newspapers may "fall through the cracks" as outlets for state government information.

The majority of informational handouts, 78 percent, originated with the public information officers — that is, the PIOs volunteered the information without a specific request from the journalists. Included in those PIO-initiated subsidies were 215 written news releases, eight news conferences, five face-to-face conversations with journalists, 27 copies of agency documents and 20 telephone calls to reporters. Information provided at the request of journalists resulted from 143 telephone queries from reporters and 26 requests from journalists, made either by telephone or in person, for specific agency records or documents, as illustrated in Table 2.

TABLE 2
Type of Information Subsidy

Agency-Initiated	*No. of Subsidies*	*Percent of Subsidies*
Written news release	215	48
Telephone call	92	21
Agency document	27	6
Press conference	8	2
In-person contact	5	1
Journalist-Initiated		
Telephone call	71	16
Agency document	26	6
Totals	444	100

Slightly more than eight in ten (81 percent) of the agency-initiated information was categorized as pro-agency because the information reflected positively on agency performance. Only 19 percent of the agency-initiated information reported on activities that reflected negatively on agency performance or on activities with mixed or neutral implications for an agency. The information disseminated in response to a journalist's specific request for information tended to be slightly less pro-agency, however, as 30 percent of these handouts provided information with either negative or neutral implications for an agency, as shown in Table 3. And it was interesting that all information provided by three state agencies — Agriculture, Public Safety, and Revenue and Taxation — was pro-agency, whether the information was initiated by the PIO or had been specifically requested by a journalist.

TABLE 3
Subsidy Information by Subsidy Initiator

	Implications of Subsidy	
Initiator of Subsidy	*Positive*	*Negative or Mixed*
Agency PIO	291 (84%)	56 (16%)
Reporter	68 (70%)	29 (30%)
Totals	359 (81%)	85 (19%)

X^2 9.271 significant at .0023
Likelihood ratio X^2 8.560 significant at .0034

As illustrated in Table 2, almost half of all public relations information was provided in written news release form. And for some agencies the percentage was even higher: almost 80 percent for the Departments of Commerce, and Industry and Agriculture. Agency PIOs said they prefer written handouts over other methods because the written releases can be prepared and disseminated efficiently, and serve as a permanent, written record of just what information was given to journalists. But they acknowledge that some journalists probably would rather receive a quick phone call than a written release, and agree that press conferences, with the opportunity for journalists to ask questions, might permit more give-and-take between source and media.

The largest number of releases and other handouts (94, or 21 percent) dealt with the subject of election campaigns and politics, while the issue focus of the smallest number (13, or 4 percent) was recreation, culture and tourism, as shown in Table 4. When the information was initiated by a PIO, it was most likely to deal with public safety or criminal matters, probably because so many releases were issued by the Department of Public Safety which by its very policy mandate concentrates its activities in this issue area. When information was provided in response to a reporter's request, the issue addressed was most likely to be election campaigns and politics. A plausible explanation might be that the Secretary of State's office and the Department of Justice, the only agen-

cies to disseminate election-related information, together received more media requests for information during the eight-week period than the other agencies combined.

TABLE 4
Issue Categories Addressed by Subsidies

Issue Category	*No. of Subsidies*	*Percent of Subsidies*
Election campaigns and politics	94	21
Economics and finance	80	18
Environment and natural resources	37	8
Public health	70	16
Public safety and criminal matters	89	20
Recreational, culture and tourism	13	3
Ceremonial events and celebrations	19	4
Administrative and personnel actions	42	9
Totals	444	100*

* Does not add to 100% because of rounding

An attempt was made to structure the issue-coding categories broadly enough so that each agency might potentially be inolved in activities that would touch on each of the issues. But the data show that several issue categories were noticeably skewed toward certain agencies. For instance, 81 percent of the Department of Public Safety's public relations handouts addressed public safety and criminal matters. And three of the issue categories — election campaigns and politics, environment and natural resources, and ceremonial events and celebrations — were each addressed by just two of the six agencies. Economics and finance issues were addressed by the largest number of agencies — four — with most other issue categories the subject of handouts from half (three) of the agencies.

This clustering of certain agencies in certain issue categories seems only partially explainable by the specific policy mandate of the agencies. While the Department of Public Safety, for instance, might have been expected to deal almost entirely with public safety or criminal matters, that was not the case. To be sure, more of its information dealt with public safety issues than with any other issue category. But almost 20 percent of its releases and other handouts dealt with recreation (donation of equipment to neighborhood youth programs), public health (policy procedures for toxic chemical spill cleanup) and administrative/personnel actions as well.

Another example of agency issue diversification was the Department of Agriculture, which devotes as much as 95 percent of its resources to inspection activities that deal almost entirely with public health or consumer protection. But the agriculture department disseminated less

than half of its information on the subject of public health and consumer protection. The majority was divided between economic and finance issues (the sale of soybeans to Taiwan), environment or natural resource issues (effects of heavy rainfall on state soil and crop conditions), public safety and criminal maters (fines levied in connection with the sale of illegal pesticides) and ceremonial or celebratory issues (announcing the public appearance/speaking engagement schedule of the state agriculture commissioner).

The degree to which attention paid to each issue category in information disseminated by an agency corresponded to attention being paid to that issue by agency personnel was further examined through interviews with agency PIOs and other agency personnel. Based on that qualitative evaluation, it appears that there generally is agreement between the information subsidy agenda of issues and the actual agency agenda of issue priorities in four departments: Commerce and Industry, Justice, Revenue and Taxation, and Secretary of State. In the Departments of Agriculture and Public Safety, however, issues addressed in information subsidies are less likely to be those issues actually receiving priority agency attention, at least in terms of resources allocated to dealing with those issues.

The data also indicate that despite the PIO's claims that they try to disseminate only information with local impact and interest — because they know that's what journalists define as newsworthy — there was little attempt to localize the information provided to these newspapers. The same information news release, for instance, was generally made available to *all* newspapers, whether there was a specific local angle or not. The same news releases or telephone calls went to journalists at *each* of the newspapers in more than six of ten instances. Information viewed as appropriate and newsworthy for one of the newspapers — *any* one of the newspapers — was viewed equally appropriate for all in most cases, although the Department of Public Safety and the Secretary of State's office were more likely than the other agencies to localize their information.

The PIOs did better at living up to their claims of using timeliness — present-day impact — as a news criterion. More than 70 percent of the information handouts dealt with events that occurred within the 24 hours prior to release, although a glaring exception to this general pattern was a news release issued by the Secretary of State's office providing information about a groundbreaking for a new state archives building that was released to newspapers three days after the event had taken place.

In disseminating these subsidies to newspaper journalists, the PIOs hoped to influence newspaper content — the media's agenda. They acted on the assumption, as expressed by Gandy, that their information would be used by journalists in stories because it was free and so easily available. In disseminating this information, the public information officers said, during interviews, that they were depending upon the journalists to in turn disseminate the information through published stories to that portion of the public that relies upon newspapers for information.

Were their assumptions and their dependency warranted? That question can be partially answered by examining newspaper use of information subsidies.

Newspaper Use of Information Subsidies. Analysis of stories published in the eight Louisiana newspapers, supplemented by "memory-recall" interviews with state capitol correspondents for each of the newspapers, showed that the newspapers used 225, or 51 percent, of the 444 information subsidies they received from PIOs for the six state agencies. The PIOs therefore were successful slightly more than half the time in gaining newspaper acceptance, through publication, of the information they provided in news releases and other public relations handouts.

Use of these 225 handouts resulted in the publication of 183 separate news stories, or 48 percent of all 383 stories the newspapers published about the six agencies during the eight-week period. Discrepancy between the number of *subsidies* used and number of *stories* that used subsidized information seems to be explained in part by the fact that several published stories included information from more than one news release or telephone call. For example, a news release on proposed amendments to the Louisiana constitution was combined into one story with two other election/political issue news releases, one on projected voter turnout for the amendment election and the other on first-time use of computerized vote tallying in that election.

This practice of using information from multiple releases in one story was not uncommon among the journalists studied. All indicated that "use" of information frequently meant the information would be combined with other available information to create one story. The journalists also indicated it was possible that one piece of information might be "used" multiple times and in multiple stories, so that the number of published stories involving use of information subsidies could potentially be larger than the number of subsidies received. However, that did not appear to be the case in this study.

The published stories about state agencies which could not be traced back to a PIO informational handout — 200 of them — were based on information provided by someone other than an agency PIO. Other sources outside the six agencies, such as a legislative or judicial source within government or a source with a private-sector organization, provided the information used in 151 of those stories that did not use public relations information. The rest were based upon information the journalists obtained from an agency official other than the PIO.

Agencies and Issues in Subsidized News Stories. The state agencies whose subsidies were most likely to be used were the Secretary of State's office and the Departments of Agriculture and Justice. More than half of the subsidies provided by PIOs for these agencies were used in published stories, as shown in Table 5. The Department of Commerce and Industry was least successful in this regard, for only 24 percent of its 38 information subsidies were used.

TABLE 5
Subsidy Use by Agency Which Provided Subsidy

	Subsidy Use		
Agency	*Accepted*	*Rejected*	*Totals*
Agriculture	39 (9%)	30 (7%)	69 (16%)
Commerce and industry	9 (2%)	29 (7%)	38 (9%)
Justice	62 (14%)	59 (13%)	121 (27%)
Public safety	44 (10%)	52 (12%)	96 (22%)
Revenue and taxation	3*	4*	7(2%)
Secretary of State	68 (15%)	45 (10%)	113 (25%)
Totals	225 (51%)	219 (49%)	444**

* Less than 1%
** Does not add to 100% becausse of rounding
X^2 17.188 significant at .0042
Likelihood ratio X^2 17.771 significant at .0032

Several agencies got better or more "play" in published stories based upon the information they provided than in published stories that used information from other, non-PIO sources. The Department of Agriculture, for instance, was the subject of only 13 percent of all 383 agency-related stories carried in the eight newspapers. But almost one-quarter of the 183 published stories that used information from a PIO subsidy were about the agriculture department. The Department of Public Safety, on the other hand, was the subject of the largest percentage of all 383 stories, but only 22 percent of the stories that used information from public information officers were about the activities of the public safety department, as shown in Table 6.

TABLE 6
Agency Distribution of Subsidized Stories

Agency	*No. of Stories*	*Percent of Stories*
Agriculture	43	24
Commerce and industry	8	4
Justice	56	31
Public safety	41	22
Revenue and taxation	2	1
Secretary of State	33	18
Totals	183	100

That some agencies would garner a proportionately larger share of the subsidized stories than other agencies might indicate that information

about their activities was not readily available *except* through a PIO. That speculation would suggest that if journalists could not learn about an agency's activities in other ways, they might be forced to rely on information from a PIO to cover that agency's news. But interviews with journalists and PIOs did not support that interpretation. In fact, neither journalists nor PIOs could give any explanation for this phenomenon other than some agencies' activities are simply more newsworthy than others.

Most of the stories that used PIO-provided information were spot news reports. News commentaries and feature stories were the least likely types of coverage. All subsidized stories about the Department of Revenue and Taxation were spot news, while the Department of Public Safety was the only agency to be the subject of a subsidized feature story and the Department of Justice was the only agency subject of a news commentary. Proportionately, public safety and criminal issues received the most attention in published stories that used agency-provided information, with election and political issues a close second. One-quarter of the subsidized stories dealt with public safety matters and 24 percent dealt with elections or politics. Recreation, culture and tourism issues were the subject of the smallest number (only one story), as shown in Table 7.

TABLE 7
Issue Category of Subsidized Stories

Issue Category	
Elections/politics	44 (24%)
Economics & finance	32 (17%)
Environment & natural resources	22 (12%)
Public health/consumer protection	32 (17%)
Public safety/criminal	46 (25%)
Recreation/culture/tourism	1*
Ceremonial/celebration	2 (1%)
Administrative/personnel	4 (2%)
Totals	183 (100%)**

* Less than 1%
** Does not add to 100% because of rounding

Proactive information subsidies — those initiated by the PIOs — were used by newspapers less often than was information provided in response to specific requests from journalists. This finding was anticipated since it was expected that if a reporter specifically requested a piece of information, that reporter already had decided the information was news and had plans to include it in a story.

A significant majority — 172, or 94 percent — of the published stories

that used information from the six agencies were neutral in tone. The choice of words to present information in these stories reflected neither positively nor negatively upon the agencies. Only 1 percent (2) of the 183 subsidized stories were unfavorable in slant, and only 5 percent (9) were favorable.

Reasons for Subsidy Use or Rejection. Inquiry into the reasons information subsidies were used or rejected by the newspapers in this study indicates that the newsworthiness of the information content was the most important consideration 82 percent of the time. The to-use or not-to-use decision on 365 of the 444 information subsidies received was based upon whether or not the journalists judged the subsidy to be timely, important to the public and readers, a report of unusual as opposed to routine happenings, and/or a report involving prominent individuals or organizations.

The literature indicates that journalists make their decisions as to what is news or newsworthy within a framework of journalistic convention and tradition. Journalists share craft values, "habits of mind" that mold their views of what is news, according to Bensman and Lelienfeld.[37] Hess found that criteria such as immediacy and impact were applied in as many as 80 percent of reporters' newsworthiness decisions,[38] and both Hess and Dunn[39] concluded that reporters demonstrate considerable consensus and consistency in their application of these craft news criteria.

It was therefore not surprising that newsworthiness of information was cited most often by these Louisiana journalists as an almost consensual basis for their decisions to use, or to discard, public relations handouts, even though that explanation might seem to some to be too "pat" to be believable. Organizational considerations of space, available resources (staff), "management" policy as to how someone or something should be treated and deadline pressures were a factor in only 18 percent of their subsidy-selection decisions, the journalists said.

The importance of newsworthiness was even clearer when that information used was examined separately from that which was rejected. Journalists said newsworthiness was the deciding factor for virtually every bit of public relations information they used. Fewer than 1 percent of the subsidies used were accepted because of organizational considerations, such as having a "space hole" which needed filling or following management policy that dictated certain kinds of coverage. Organizational considerations seemed more important in deciding to reject subsidies: of the information not used, 86 percent was rejected because journalists judged it not newsworthy, while 14 percent was rejected because of space, resources, policy or deadline considerations.

The specific criterion of newsworthiness journalists cited most often as justification for accepting or rejecting an information subsidy was presence or absence of a local angle. If there was a local angle, or some local impact, the information was used, according to the journalists. But if there was not, the subsidy was discarded as non-news. Some information was rejected primarily because it was not timely — the information was "old" or "stale," according to the journalists.

The organizational consideration that accounted most often for subsidy rejection was unavailability of staff to write the story. If information was received while a journalist was on vacation, off the job due to illness, or out of the office covering another story, that information was discarded regardless of its newsworthiness because there was no one to write the story. Nor would it be used later when a reporter did become available, because by then it would no longer be timely.

Journalists seemed to apply the same to-use/not-to-use selection criteria to both agency-initiated subsidies and to those subsidies that resulted from a reporter's specific request for information. One might have expected that newsworthiness would almost be a "given" in reporter-requested information, while proactive agency subsidies without a journalist's cue might be expected to undergo greater newsworthiness scrutiny. But that was not the case — newsworthiness criteria were applied in decisions affecting 93 percent of the agency-initiated information and 92 percent of the reporter-requested information.

Public Relations Impact Upon News Coverage

As the data show, these Louisiana PIOs were successful in half of their media-subsidization efforts. Half of their news releases and other informational handouts were "used" by the newspapers to which they provided information, and almost half of the news stories written about these state agencies included information provided to journalists by the PIOs. But how well did the PIOs do in making newspaper content different from what it might have been without the information they provided? Several tendencies emerge from closer examination of the data. At first glance, there seems to be a positive relationship between the volume of information provided by a PIO and the volume of that information used in newspaper coverage of his agency. After all, the Department of Justice, which provided the largest number of information subsidies, was the subject of the largest number of subsidized stories. But it is important to remember that a public relations practitioner's information is not the only information used in newspaper stories. Even though the PIO may be successful in "placing" his largely pro-agency information in newspaper stories, a newspaper may publish additional stories into which the PIO did not have input. Therefore, a more important relationship than number of subsidies to number of subsidized stories would be the proportion of *all* stories published about an agency in which a PIO had some influence.

It appears that the Department of Agriculture, not the Department of Justice, actually did a better job overall of influencing newspaper content. For even though the Department of Agriculture PIO disseminated only 69 information subsidies — 16 percent of all subsidies provided by the six agencies — his information subsidies were used in 84 percent of all stories written about his agency. The Department of Justice by comparison disseminated 121 subsidies, the largest number of any agency, but information from those subsidies was used in only 55 percent of all

stories written about the department. By this same standard, the Department of Revenue and Taxation was the least successful in influencing media content — it issued the fewest subsidies but its subsidies also were used in only 18 percent of all stories written about it, as shown in Table 8.

TABLE 8
Subsidy Influence on Newspaper Stories

	Subsidies		*Stories*		
Agency	*Number*	*Percent*	*Subsidized*	*Total*	*Percent Subsidized*
Agriculture	69	16	43	51	84
Commerce/industry	38	9	8	18	44
Justice	121	27	56	102	55
Public safety	96	22	41	145	28
Revenue/taxation	7	2	2	11	18
Secretary of State	113	25	33	56	59
Totals	444	100	183	383	Mean = 48

A second tendency revealed by this data is that persuasive public relations tactics do not seem to be as effective with journalists as tactics that involve providing information intended to inform without necessarily persuading.

No comparison can be made between practitioners of the persuasive two-way asymmetric model of public relations and those for whom the non-persuasive two-way symmetric model was dominant because the two-way agencies studied were not differentiated as to whether they practiced asymmetric or symmetric two-way public relations. But comparison of those agencies that practiced the press agentry/publicity (persuasive) and public information (non-persuasive) models indicates that perhaps those whose public relations behavior fit the public information model are more successful than those who fit the press agentry/publicity model in getting their information into news stories. The Department of Agriculture, an agency for which the public information model was dominant, was most successful of all six agencies in actually influencing newspaper content. A greater proportion of the newspaper stories about the Department of Agriculture included information from the department's PIO than was the case for any other agency. The agency that was least successful — the Department of Revenue and Taxation — was one whose public relations behavior was dominated by the persuasive press agentry/publicity model.

Other variables, such as the perceived newsworthiness of the information provided, undoubtedly also influenced whether a PIO's news release or handout was used in a published news story. But based on Grunig's

explication of the four models of public relations behavior, it seems logical that whether public relations communication has a persuasive intent or not might also influence how that communication is viewed by journalists. Persuasive public relations, such as that practiced under the press agentry/publicity model, is one-sided, giving the organization's point of view with the intention of persuading the public to adopt that viewpoint. Such an attempt to manipulate public acceptance might well be seen as suspect subjectivity to journalists for whom objectivity is an important craft value. Information presented objectively, as is the case when the presenter is a "journalist in residence" PIO practicing the public information model of public relations, perhaps comes closer to what the journalist himself or herself would select as important for public dissemination if he or she were the one doing the selection.

Support for Hypotheses. Do these tendencies, and the data upon which they are based, thus support the hypotheses? The answer is, generally, yes. One premise of the first hypothesis of this study — that daily newspapers were more likely to use public relations information in published stories than they were to discard that information — was supported by the data. The eight newspapers used 225, or 51 percent, of the 444 information subsidies they received from the six state agencies, with use defined as inclusion of any or all of a subsidy's information content in a published news story.

But a second premise — that published stories about government are more likely to be based upon government's "official" handouts of information than on information obtained from other sources — was not supported. Although 51 percent of the news releases and other handouts were accepted, those accepted resulted in the publication of only 183 news stories, 48 percent of the total number of stories published about these six state agencies during the eight-week period. Therefore, even though more than half of the PIO-generated information was accepted, public relations handouts influenced less than half of the total news coverage given these agencies.

The second hypothesis — that the most important factor in a newspaper's decision to accept or reject an agency information subsidy is whether the subsidy is newsworthy — also was supported by the data. In fact, support for this hypothesis is quite strong, since newsworthiness of a subsidy was the reason journalists gave for acceptance or rejection 81 percent of the time.

A third hypothesis — that the agenda of issues in newspaper stories which used information from state agency PIOs would reflect the issue agenda and priorities of the agency information subsidies — also was supported. Rank-order correlation of issues in agency subsidies and in subsidy-based newspaper stories was strong and statistically significant, as shown in Table 9.

The implications of this positive correlation are important for agencies and their public information officers. Newspaper stories which incorporate or use information provided to journalists by the agency PIOs seem to more accurately reflect the agencies' agenda of salient issues than does the broader, more general group of *all* stories written about

the agencies. Therefore, it can be concluded that agencies generally are successful in transmitting issue salience as well as raw information when they are successful in gaining use of their subsidies by journalists. When sources other than agency PIOs provide information for stories, as was the case in more than half of all stories published about the agencies, the issue salience reflected in the stories seems to be not that of the agencies but that of the other sources or of the journalists themselves.

TABLE 9
Issue Rank-Order Correlation:
Subsidies, Subsidized Stories and All Agency Stories

Issue	*Subsidies*	*Subsidized Stories*	*All Stories*
Election campaigns and politics	1 (N = 94)	2 (N = 44)	3 (N = 59)
Public safety and criminal matters	2 (N = 89)	1 (N = 46)	1 (N = 136)
Economics and finance	3 (N = 80)	3-4 (N = 32)	2 (N = 82)
Public health and consumer protection	4 (N = 70)	3-4 (N = 32)	4 (N = 50)
Administrative and personnel actions	5 (N = 42)	6 (N = 4)	8 (N = 6)
Environment and natural resources	6 (N = 37)	5 (N = 22)	5 (N = 28)
Ceremonial events and celebrations	7 (N = 19)	7 (N = 2)	7 (N = 9)
Recreation, culture and tourism	8 (N = 13)	8 (N = 1)	6 (N = 13)
	N = 444	N = 183	N = 383

Kendall's tau-b correlation coefficients:
1. agency subsidies with subsidized stories .8365, significant at .01 level;
2. agency subsidies with all stories .5714, significant at 0.5 level;
3. subsidized stories with all stories .6910, significant at .02 level.

The fourth hypothesis — that agencies for which persuasive models of public relations are dominant are less successful than those using non-persuasive tactics in obtaining use of their information in published news stories — also was supported by the data. Although not enough agencies were represented in this sample to permit broad generalization, there is at least a strong suggestion that straightforward presentation of information — with no organizational "spin" on it — may be better received by the media than informaion intended to persuade either media or public to "buy" an organization's point of view.

Conclusions and Implications

Public Relations and Its Practice. Several conclusions relative to public relations and its practice in state government, and perhaps in other organizational settings, can be drawn from this study's data. One of the most obvious conclusions is that state agencies that rely upon

public information officers to "get the word out" to win support for agency policies and programs may be overrating the ability of PIOs to influence the agency picture portrayed by the news media for consumption by those who get their information about state government from the media. The data indicate that only half of the information Louisiana newspaper readers receive from their newspapers about state agencies is information the agencies provided as part of a systematic effort to "get the word out" to the public. And most of that subsidy-influenced newspaper coverage was neutral, not as pro-agency as the raw material of information provided in PIO subsidies.

Perhaps effectiveness, at least in the sense of getting public relations information into print so it can reach its intended public audience, would be increased if more agencies — and perhaps other types of organizations as well — adopted a public information or two-way model of public relations behavior rather then the self-serving, persuasive press agentry/publicity model that, in this study at least, achieved less than the results desired by the agencies and their public relations staffs. And perhaps state agencies, and other types of organizations as well, should disseminate fewer informational handouts to journalists at agency initiative. Since agency-initiated information was rejected more often than information provided in response to a journalist's specific request, PIOs and other public relations practitioners should perhaps take a route of less risk and concentrate on reactive information-giving.

Another conclusion that can be drawn is that public relations practitioners might also devote greater attention generally to the newsworthiness of the information they offer to journalists, since newsworthiness — or its lack — was the reason given by reporters for the great majority of their decisions as to whether to use a particular information subsidy. If more news releases met journalists' criteria of newsworthiness — a local angle, impact upon the public and timeliness in particular — then perhaps more of the information they contain would be used in the stories those journalists write.

News Media Decision Processes. Because this study focused not just on public relations practices but also on the interaction between public relations practitioners and journalists, the data also lead to several conclusions regarding journalistic behavior. One conclusion is that daily newspaper reporters appear to be the primary decision-makers in terms of what is or is not included in newspaper content. In this study, it was the reporters, not their editors or publishers, who received agency information from public information officers and decided whether that information should be written as news stories. These reporters said they made those decisions on the basis of whether the information was newsworthy, and they also said that their decisions usually prevailed. If they wrote a story based upon a public relations handout, or upon any other source of information, that story usually was printed. If they decided information was not newsworthy and discarded it without writing a story, they were usually not overruled. Editors and even publishers may well perform "gatekeeper" functions in a newspaper's operation, but this data indicate that editors and publishers were not

substantially involved in deciding what deserved to be written and that reporters are the ones performing the primary, first-level gatekeeping function.

This study also substantiated conclusions of earlier studies of journalistic decision-making that shared craft values of "newsworthiness" are what open, or keep closed, the gates to newspaper content. These reporters said, in open-ended interviews, that newsworthiness was their primary consideration in deciding whether to use information in the stories they wrote. That description of how they made decisions was borne out in a handout-by-handout examination of why they did, or did not, use the information they received from the agency public information officers. Eight times in ten, a public relations handout was used, or not used, because it did, or did not, fit the reporters' definitions of what was newsworthy.

It should be noted that while reporters and public information officers both said the chief characteristics of newsworthiness were timeliness, proximity, impact and prominence, the two groups differed in their application of those newsworthiness criteria to information. If public information officers applied those newsworthiness criteria to their decisions about what information to distribute in the same way reporters applied those criteria to their decisions about what to use in written news stories, then one would have expected every public relations handout of information to find its way into a news story. But that was not the case. Based on the public relations literature and on interviews with these public information officers, it appears that the public information officers' decisions about what information to disseminate were perhaps compromised by conflicting roles. In their role as journalists-in-residence within their agencies, these public information officers said their job was to distribute newsworthy information to the news media — with newsworthiness defined by the same criteria as those used by journalists. But as advocates for their agencies, a second role, they seemed at times to distribute information that reflected positively and favorably upon their agency even when that information was not newsworthy. Since PIO and journalist definitions of newsworthiness were consonant, it seems reasonable to conclude that role conflict perhaps led to PIO dissemination of non-newsworthy information that was discarded by journalists.

A third conclusion, one that perhaps relates more to the "folklore" of journalism and public relations than to the research-based literature in either field, is that journalists appear to prefer self-generated information, or information "straight from the horse's mouth," over information provided by a public relations source. In the folklore of journalism a premium is placed upon information "dug up" through reportorial entrepreneurship and initiative that makes the "scoop" and the "exclusive" more valued than a news story that any reporter, or any news medium, might include in its news report. Also, in journalistic folklore there is a distrust, or mistrust, of public relations practitioners as biased "flacks" engaged in puffery and manipulation of information, and indeed public relations practitioners themselves are indoctrinated to ex-

pect that attitude of distrust from journalists. While these Louisiana reporters stated neither a preference for information they unearthed themselves nor a basic distrust of public relations practitioners, their news selection decisions seemed to indicate a preference for stories that were not subsidized by public information officers. More than half (52 percent) of all the stories they wrote about these state agencies relied on non-public relations sources or upon their own personal staffing of an event. It could be that some of the information provided by the public information officers was not used simply because it wasn't reporter-generated information or because it came from a "flack" perceived as biased, with the newsworthiness of the information actually a secondary consideration. It could also be that the journalists applied their criteria of newsworthiness more stringently to information from public information officers than to information from other sources, resulting in the rejection of a large number of public information subsidies, because that information was viewed as somehow tainted and suspect to begin with because of its origins.

The Media's Agenda-Setting Function. This study also gives rise to conclusions regarding the agenda-setting function of the mass media — at least as that function is performed by daily newspapers. This study did not compare any media agendas of issues and their salience with public agendas, and therefore no conclusions regarding whether, and to what extent, the media perform this agenda-setting function can, or will, be drawn. But an attempt was made here to examine one question relative to the media's agenda, namely who sets the media's agenda. The literature of agenda-setting indicates that the sources of information upon which journalists rely helps to shape the resulting agenda of issues and issue salience that the media pass along to the public. Based on the data generated by this study, it might be concluded that public relations practitioners, or at least the information they provide to journalists, influence the media agenda. While not every attempt by a public information officer to influence news coverage of his or her agency was successful, almost half of the news stories written about these six state agencies did include information from a public relations source. Even more importantly, perhaps, the news stories that were "subsidized" by public information officers included not only the raw information of facts and figures the agencies wanted the public to receive but also reflected the PIOs' and agencies' judgments as to the salience of that information. If the public indeed "learns" not only cognitions but also priorities from the agenda presented by the mass media, as the literature suggests, then it appears that at least some — in this study almost half — of those priorities are being "set" by public relations sources of information.

But what about the rest of the time, when public relations sources do not contribute information to a news story, as was the case 52 percent of the time in this study? Who sets the media's agenda then? Perhaps it is still sources, for even though agency public information officers' information was not used in these stories, other types of sources may have contributed information and salience. Some of those sources may have sought to influence the media agenda in much the same purposeful

subsidy-providing way as the agency public information officers. Others were, according to these Louisiana reporters, sought out by the journalists, so that any influence they had was the result of a journalist's action that made the journalist a contributor to "setting" the subsequent media agenda. This study did not examine these "other" sources in sufficient detail to support conclusions about their influence on the media agenda, but such an examination would seem a fruitful avenue for future research.

NOTES

1. Emmette S. Redford, *Democracy in the Administrative State* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1969), p. 8.

2. Walter Lippmann, *Public Opinion* (New York: Macmillan, 1961), chapter 24, *passim*.

3. See David K. Berlo, *The Process of Communication* (New York: Holt, 1960); Bernard Berelson and Gary A. Steiner, *Human Behavior* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1964); Wilbur Schramm, ed., *Mass Communication* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1960; Wilbur Schramm, *The Process and Effects of Mass Communication* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1961); and Wilbur Schramm, *The Science of Human Communication* (New York: Basic Books, 1963).

4. William L. Rivers and Wilbur D. Schramm, *Responsibility in Mass Communication* (New York: Harper and Row, 1969), pp. 27-28.

5. Donald L. Shaw and Maxwell E. McCombs, *The Emergence of American Political Issues: The Agenda-Setting Function of the Press* (St. Paul: West Publishing, 1977), p. 151.

6. Bernard C. Cohen, *The Press and Foreign Policy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963), p.13

7. For a review of the literature, see Maxwell McCombs and Sheldon Gilbert "News Influence on Our Picture of the World," in *Perspectives on Media Effects*, ed. Jennings Bryant and Dolf Zillmann (Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, forthcoming) and D. F. Roberts and C. M. Bachen, "Mass Communication Effects," *Annual Review of Psychology* 32: 307-56 (1981).

For a discussion of general media agenda-setting effects on the public, see Jack M. McLeod, Lee B. Becker and James E. Byrnes, "Another Look at the Agenda-Setting Function of the Press," *Communication Research* 1: 131-166 (April 1974); Lutz Erbring, Edie N. Goldenberg and Arthur H. Miller, "Front-Page News and Real-World Cues: A New Look at Agenda-Setting by the Media," *American Journal of Political Science* 24: 16-49 (February 1980); and Shaw and McCombs, *Emergence of American Political Issues*.

For a discussion of media agenda-setting effects on public voting behavior, see Thomas E. Patterson, *The Mass Media Election: How Americans Choose Their President* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1980); John P. Robinson, "The Press and the Voter," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 427: 95-103 (September 1976); Maxwell E. McCombs and Donald L. Shaw, "Structuring the Unseen Environment," *Journal of Communication* 26: 18-23 (1976); and L. Tipton, R. D. Haney and J. R. Baseheart, "Media Agenda-Setting in City and State Election Campaigns," *Journalism Quarterly* 52: 15-22 (Spring 1975).

8. See Erbring, Goldenberg and Miller, "Front Page News;" David H. Weaver, Maxwell E. McCombs and Charles Spellman, "Watergate and the Media: A Case Study of Agenda-Setting," *American Politics Quarterly* 3: 458-473 (October 1975); McLeod, Becker and Byrnes, "Another Look at the Agenda-Setting Function;" McCombs and Shaw, "Structuring the Unseen Environment;" and Jay G. Blumler, "The Role of Theory in Uses and Gratification Studies," *Communications Research* 6: 9-36 (January 1979).

9. Gaye Tuchman, *Making News: A Study in the Construction of Reality* (New York: The Free Press, 1978), pp. 210-211.

10. Leon V. Sigal, *Reporters and Officials: The Organization and Politics of Newsmaking* (Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Co., 1973), p. 37.

11. Oscar H. Gandy, Jr., *Beyond Agenda-Setting: Information Subsidies and Public Policy* (Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing Co., 1982), p., 14.

12. Herbert J. Gans, *Deciding What's News: A Study of CBS Evening News, NBC Nightly News, Newsweek and Time* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1979), p. 117.
13. Robert E. Park, "News as a Form of Knowledge: A Chapter in the Sociology of Knowledge," in *Mass Media and Communication*, Charles E. Steinberg, ed. (New York: Hastings House, 1966), pp. 133-134.
14. Leon V. Sigal, *Reporters and Officials*, p. 104.
15. Dennis W. Jeffers, "Performance Expectations as a Measure of Relative Status of News and PR People," *Journalism Quarterly* 54: 299-306 (Summer 1977).
16. Mark Fishman, *Manufacturing the News* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1980) p. 50.
17. Gandy, *Beyond Agenda Setting*, pp. 11-12.
18. Scott M. Cutlip, "Third of Newspapers' Content PR-Inspired," *Editor and Publisher* May 26, 1962, p. 68.
19. William P. Martin and Michael W. Singletary, "Newspaper Treatment of State Government Releases," *Journalism Quarterly* 58: 93-96 (Spring 1981).
20. David H. Harris, "Publicity Releases: Why They End Up in the Wastebasket," *Industrial Marketing* 46: 98-100 (1961).
21. Walter Ward, "News Values, News Situations and News Selections," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Iowa, 1967.
22. Johann Galtung and Mari Ruge, "The Structure of Foreign News," in *Media Sociology*, Jeremy Tunstall ed. (London: Constable, 1970), pp. 259-298.
23. Gans, *Deciding What's News*, pp. 147-175.
24. Douglas Ann Johnson Newsom, "Creating Concepts of Reality: Media Reflections of the Consumer Movement," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas, 1978.
25. Erbring, Goldenberg, and Miller, "Front-Page News," pp. 16-49.
26. Maxwell McCombs, Sheldon Gilbert and Chaim Eyal, "The State of the Union Address and the Press Agenda: A Replication," unpublished paper, Syracuse University, 1983.
27. David Weaver and Swanzy Nimley Elliott, "Who Sets the Agenda for the Media? A Study of Local Agenda-Building," paper presented to the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Gainesville, Fla., August 1984.
28. F. Dennis Hale, "Press Releases v. Newspaper Coverage of California Supreme Court Decisions," *Journalism Quarterly* 55: 696-702 (Winter 1978).
29. James E. Grunig and Todd Hunt, *Managing Public Relations* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1984) chapter 2.
30. Stephen Hess, *The Government/Press Connection: Press Officers and Their Offices* (Washington: The Brookings Institution, 1984), p.3.
31. Grunig and Hunt, *Managing Public Relations*, chapter 2.
32. Grunig and Hunt, *ibid.*
33. Grunig and Hunt, *ibid.*
34. Grunig and Hunt, *ibid.*
35. Grunig and Hunt, p. 27.
36. Grunig and Hunt, p. 43.
37. Joseph Bensman and Robert Lilienfeld, *Craft and Consciousness: Occupational Technique and the Development of World Images* (New York: John Wiley, 1973), p. 1.
38. Stephen Hess, *The Washington Reporters* (Washington: The Brookings Institution, 1981), p. 15.
39. Delmer D. Dunn, *Public Officials and the Press* (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969), pp. 24-25.

Make San Antonio Your Mission

AEJMC Convention

August 1-4, 1987
Trinity University
San Antonio, Texas

AEJMC Mission 100: The Next 25 Years

JOURNALISM MONOGRAPHS

No. 1 – Walter B. Emery, "Five European Broadcasting Systems," *August 1969*
No. 2 – Eugene J. Webb and Jerry R. Salancik, "The Interview or the Only Wheel in Town," *November 1969*
No. 3 – James E. Grunig, "The Role of Information in Economic Decision Making," *December 1969*
No. 4 – Linda Weiner Hausman, "Criticism of the Press in U.S. Periodicals, 1900-1969: An Annotated Bibliography," *August 1967*
No. 5 – George Gerbner, "The Press and the Dialogue in Education," *September 1967*
No. 6 – Peter R. Knights, "The Press Association War of 1866-1867," *December 1967*
No. 7 – Elmer Davis, "Report to the President," edited by Ronald T. Farrar, *August 1968*
No. 8 – Steven H. Chaffee and L. Scott Ward, "Channels of Communication in School-Community Relations," *September 1968*
No. 9 – Walter Wilcox, "The Press, the Jury and the Behavioral Sciences," *October 1968*
No. 10 – Don R. Pember, "The Smith Act as a Restraint on the Press," *May 1969*
No. 11 – Joy Schaleben, "Getting the Story Out of Nazi Germany: Louis P. Lochner," *June 1968*
No. 12 – Carter R. Bryan, "Negro Journalism in America Before Emancipation," *September 1968*
No. 13 – George Gerbner, "The Film Hero: A Cross-Cultural Study," *November 1969*
No. 14 – Steven H. Chaffee, Keith R. Stamm, Jose L. Guerrero and Leonard P. Tipton, "Experiments in Cognitive Discrepancies and Communication," *December 1969*
No. 15 – Darwin Payne, "The Press Corps and the Kennedy Assassination," *February 1970*
No. 16 – Elmer A. Beck, "Autopsy of a Labor Daily: The Milwaukee Leader," *August 1970*
No. 17 – Jim A. Richstad, "The Press Under Martial Law: The Hawaiian Experience," *November 1970*
No. 18 – Mary A. Gardner, "The Press of Guatemala," *February 1971*
No. 19 – Robert L. Bishop and LaMar S. Mackay, "Mysterious Silence, Lyrical Scream: Government Information in World War II," *May 1971*
No. 20 – Phillip Palmgreen, "A Day-Brown Model of Communication," *August 1971*
No. 21 – William E. Francois, "Evaluating Programmed News Writing Instructions," *November 1971*
No. 22 – David Gordon, "The 1896 Maryland Shield Law: The American Roots of Evidentiary Privilege for Newsmen," *February 1972*
No. 23 – Karen Mooradian, "The Dawn of Printing," *May 1972*
No. 24 – Maxwell E. McCombs, "Mass Media in the Marketplace," *August 1972*
No. 25 – John W. Garberson, "A Limited Number of Advertising Pages," *November 1972*
No. 26 – Thomas H. Guback and Steven P. Hill, "The Beginnings of Soviet Broadcasting and the Role of V.I. Lenin," *December 1972*
No. 27 – John D. Stevens, "From the Back of the Poolside: Black Correspondents in World War II," *February 1973*
No. 28 – Don Dodson and William A. Hachten, "Communication and Development: African and Afro-American Parallels," *May 1973*
No. 29 – Guido H. Stempel III, "Effects on Performance of a Cross-Media Monopoly," *June 1973*
No. 30 – Beth Heiffner, "Communicatory Accuracy: Four Experiments," *August 1973*
No. 31 – Jerry W. Knudson, "The Press and the Bolivian National Revolution," *November 1973*
No. 32 – Herbert Strentz, Kenneth Starck, David L. Anderson and Loren Ghiglione, "The Critical Factor: Criticism of the News Media in Journalism Education," *February 1974*
No. 33 – Edmund M. Mishra, "A.J. Liebling: The Wayward Pressman as Critic," *April 1974*
No. 34 – James E. Murphy, "The New Journalism: A Critical Perspective," *May 1974*
No. 35 – Donald S. Kreger, "Press Opinion in the Eagleton Affair," *August 1974*
No. 36 – Steven H. Chaffee, Ed., Godwin C. Chu, Jack Lyle and Wayne Danielson, "Contributions of Wilbur Schramm to Mass Communication Research," *October 1974*
No. 37 – John Dimmick, "The Gate-Keeper: An Uncertainty Theory," *November 1974*
No. 38 – Mary Ann Yodelis, "Who Paid the Piper? Publishing Economics in Boston, 1763-1775," *February 1975*
No. 39 – Shelton A. Gunaratne, "The Turning of the Press in Sri Lanka," *May 1975*
No. 40 – Robert N. Pierce, "Lord Northcliffe: Press-Affairs Influences," *August 1975*
No. 41 – Mary M. Connors, "Presidential Publicity: An Assessment," *September 1975*
No. 42 – Steven H. Chaffee and Peter Clarke, "Training and Employment of Ph.D.'s in Mass Communication," *November 1975*
No. 43 – Donald R. Browne, "The Voice of America: Policies and Problems," *February 1976*
No. 44 – Donald R. Holland, "Volney B. Palmer (1799-1864): The Nation's First Advertising Agency Man," *May 1976*
No. 45 – Clifford G. Christians, "Jacques Ellul and Democracy's 'Vital Information' Premise," *August 1976*
No. 46 – James E. Grunig, "Organizations and Public Relations: Testing a Communication Theory," *November 1976*
No. 47 – Frank L. Kaplan, "The Czech and Slovak Press: The First 100 Years," *January 1977*
No. 48 – Douglas A. Boyd, "Egyptian Radio: Tool of Political and National Development," *February 1977*
No. 49 – Margaret A. Blanchard, "The Hutchins Commission, the Press and the Responsibility Concept," *May 1977*
No. 50 – David L. Paletz and Dennis LaPiere, "The Press and Authority: Portrayals of a Coach and a Mayor," *August 1977*
No. 51 – Manny Lanoff, "Telecommunications Management and Policy: Who Governs?" *November 1977*
No. 52 – John E. Nichols, "The Tinker Case and Its Interpretation," *December 1977*
No. 53 – Susan Heidmann Miller, "Reporters and Congressmen: Living in Symbiosis," *January 1978*
No. 54 – Jerry W. Knudson, "Herbert L. Matthews and the Cuban Story," *February 1978*
No. 55 – Mark R. Levy, "The Audience Experience With Television News," *April 1978*
No. 56 – Paul W. Sullivan, "News Piracy: Unfair Competition and the Misappropriation Doctrine," *May 1978*
No. 57 – Gail Lund Barwis, "Contextual Newsroom Dimensions," *August 1978*
No. 58 – C. Richard Hofstetter, "News Bias in the 1972 Campaign: A Cross-Media Comparison," *November 1978*
No. 59 – Eric J. Zanot, "The National Advertising Review Board, 1971-1978," *February 1979*
No. 60 – Frank Wm. White, "Cameras in the Courtroom: A U.S. Survey," *April 1979*
No. 61 – Philip Palmgreen, "Mass Media Use and Political Knowledge," *May 1979*
No. 62 – R. Gordon Shepherd, "Science News of Controversy: The Case of Marijuana," *August 1979*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

No. 63 – John P. Robinson and Leo W. Jeffres. "The Changing Role of Newspapers in the Age of Television." *September 1979*

No. 64 – P. Jean Frazer and Cecilia Gaeanu. "Robert Ezra Park's Theory of News, Public Opinion and Social Control." *November 1979*

No. 65 – David J. Russo. "The Origins of Local News in the U.S. Country Press, 1840s-1870s." *February 1980*

No. 66 – Michael Ryan. "Journalism Education at the Master's Level." *March 1980*

No. 67 – David H. Weaver and G. Cleveland Wilhoit. "News Media Coverage of U.S. Senators in Four Congresses, 1953-1974." *April 1980*

No. 68 – Harold A. Fisher. "The EBU: Model for Regional Cooperation in Broadcasting." *May 1980*

No. 69 – Eugene F. Shaw and Daniel Riffe. "NIS and Radio's All News Predicament." *August 1980*

No. 70 – Jerome S. Silber. "Broadcast Regulation and the First Amendment." *November 1980*

No. 71 – Marion Cuthbert. "The Caribbean News Agency: Third World Model." *February 1981*

No. 72 – Terry Hynes. "Magazine Portrayal of Women, 1911-1980." *May 1981*

No. 73 – Wayne M. Towers. "World Series Coverage in New York City in the 1920s." *August 1981*

No. 74 – W. Gilbert Dunn and Douglas W. Cooper (with assistance of D. Brock Hornby and David W. Leslie). "A Guide to Mass Communication Sources." *November 1981* (Out of print)

No. 75 – Lawrence Brown. "Advertising and the Poor." *February 1982*

No. 76 – Bruce W. Swain. "The Progressives, the Bomb and the Papers." *May 1982*

No. 77 – Daniel W. Pfaff. "Joseph Pulitzer II and Advertising Censorship, 1929-1939." *July 1982*

No. 78 – John Spicer Nichols. "Cuban Mass Media: Organization, Control and Functions." *November 1982*

No. 79 – Willard D. Rowland Jr. "The Illusion of Fulfillment: The Broadcast Reform Movement." *December 1982*

No. 80 – Robert J. Goldstein. "Freedom of the Press in Europe, 1815-1914." *February 1983*

No. 81 – James E. Grunig. "Communication Behaviors and Attitudes of Environmental Publics: Two Studies." *March 1983*

No. 82 – Karen K. List. "The Role of William Cobbett in Philadelphia's Party Press, 1794-1799." *May 1983* (Out of print)

No. 83 – Hugh M. Culbertson. "Three Perspectives on American Journalism." *June 1983*

No. 84 – Keith R. Stamm and Lisa Fortini-Campbell. "The Relationship of Community Ties to Newspaper Use." *August 1983*

No. 85 – Dean W. O'Brien. "The News as Environment." *September 1983*

No. 86 – Fred Fejes. "The U.S. in Third World Communications: Latin America, 1900-1945." *November 1983*

No. 87 – Warren K. Agee and Nelson Traquina. "A Frustrated Fourth Estate: Portugal's Post-Revolutionary Mass Media." *February 1984*

No. 88 – David Paul Nord. "The Evangelical Origins of Mass Media in America, 1815-1835." *May 1984*

No. 89 – Gerald J. Baldasty. "The Press and Politics in the Age of Jackson." *August 1984*

No. 90 – C.N. Olien, G.A. Donohue and P.J. Tichenor. "Media and Stages of Social Conflict." *November 1984*

No. 91 – Mary Alliene Hamilton. "J.W. Gitts: The Cold War's Voice in the Wilderness." *February 1985*

No. 92 – Harry D. Marsh. "Holding Carter's Newspaper on School Desegration, 1954-1955." *May 1985*

No. 93 – W. Wat Hopkins. "Negligence 101 Years After Gertz v. Welch." *August 1985*

No. 94 – George E. Stevens. "Discrimination in the Newsroom: Title VII and the Journalist." *September 1985*

No. 95 – Denise M. Trauth and John L. Huffman. "Obscenity and Cable Television: A Regulatory Approach." *March 1986*

No. 96 – Richard Burket Kielbowicz. "Origins of the Second-Class Mail Category and the Business of Policymaking, 1863-1879." *April 1986*

No. 97 – Howard Good. "The Image of War Correspondents in Anglo-American Fiction." *July 1986*

No. 98 – Richard Lentz. "Sixty-Five Days in Memphis: A Study of Culture, Symbols, and the Press." *August 1986*

No. 99 – R. Thomas Berner. "Literary Newswriting: The Death of an Oxymoron." *October 1986*

No. 100 – Judy VanSlyke Turk. "Information Subsidies and Media Content: A Study of Public Relations Influence on the News." *December 1986*

JOURNALISM MONOGRAPHS
1621 COLLEGE ST.
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COLUMBIA, SC 29208-0251
ADDRESS CORRECTION REQUESTED

NON-PROFIT
ORGANIZATION
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
COLUMBIA, SC
PERMIT NO. 198